

Appl. No. 09/997,513
Amdt. Dated: February 21, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 9, 2006

Docket No. IRJ05441
Customer No. 23330

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-18 and 20-23 have been cancelled. Claims 4, 19 and 24 remain in the application. The actions taken are in the interest of expediting prosecution and with no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art. Moreover, the amendment or cancellation of claims herein is without prejudice to pursuing claims of different scope by way of continuing Application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action states that claims 1-3, 6, 8-18, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,108,540 issued to Sonti et al. ("Sonti") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,453,162 issued to Gentry ("Gentry") in further view of Lahtinen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,019) and Hamann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,191) ("Niepel"). The Office Action states that claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for allegedly being unpatentable over Sonti and Gentry/ Lahtinen/Hamann and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,058,301 to Daniels ("Daniels"). The Office Action states that claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for allegedly being unpatentable over Sonti and Gentry/lahtinen/Hamann and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,681,232 to Sistanizadeh ("Sistanizadeh").

Claims 1-3, 5-18 and 20-23 have been cancelled, rendering these rejections moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 19 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Appl. No. 09/997,513
Amdt. Dated: February 21, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 9, 2006

Docket No. IRI05441
Customer No. 23330

Summary

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 502117, Motorola, Inc.


Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number 23330

By:


Kevin D. Wills
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 43,993
Telephone: 480-732-5364
Fax No.: 480-732-2402